

(MR. SPEAKER)

our Chief Minister, the Leader of the House, has completed 60 years and has entered upon his 61st year. I suppose that it is the desire of this House and the desire of myself also that we offer our felicitations and convey to him our respectful regards and wish him many many happy returns of Birth Day enabling him to serve the country in a greater and greater measure. I suppose that is the feeling of the entire House.

[This was followed by loud and prolonged cheers by the House].

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—(Minister for Home).—I lay on the Table, Notification No. HD 39 TMT 62, dated 19th October 1962 (reduction of tax payable under the Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1957), Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1957.

Bills introduced.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—(Minister for Finance).—I beg to introduce the Mysore Appropriation (No. 6) Bill, 1962 which has been published in the Mysore Gazette under Rule 64 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Mysore Appropriation (No. 6) Bill, 1962 is introduced.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I beg to introduce Bombay Primary Education (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1962 which has been published in the Mysore Gazette under Rule 64 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Bombay Primary Education (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1962 is introduced.

MYSORE APPROPRIATION (No. 6) BILL, 1962

Motion to consider.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 6) Bill, 1962 be taken into consideration.”

MR. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 6) Bill, 1962 be taken into consideration.”

Sri B. D. JATTI.—This Bill is introduced to provide for appropriation out of the consolidated fund of the State monies required towards defraying several further charges which come in course of payment during the year ending 31st March 1963. It is not necessary to give more information.

MR. SPEAKER.—I suppose that we have discussed everything when discussing the supplementary Demands and Estimates. So, I will put it to the House.

The question is :

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 6) Bill, 1962, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That clauses 2, 3 and the Schedule stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2, 3 and Schedule were added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I move:

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 6) Bill, 1962 be passed.”

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That the Mysore Appropriation (No. 6) Bill, 1962 be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

THE MYSORE LAND REVENUE

[Surcharge] (Amendment)

BILL, 1962.

(Debate Continued).

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Hebbur).—I raised a point of order on Saturday.

MR. SPEAKER.—I think that the Presiding Officer has given a ruling on that day.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sri Annarao Ganamukhi who has then in the Chair told me that he will consider. No ruling was given.

MR. SPEAKER.—What is the point of order that you have raised and on which, ruling is to be given?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—The point is whether I may be allowed to speak on the Bill again in support of the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER.—You want to know whether you can be given a second chance. I learn that a ruling has been given.

Sri V. M. DEO (Gubbi).—When you were here, the Leader of the Opposition was moving the amendment and I heard you say that he was just moving the motion and not speaking on the main motion. In other words I take it by implication that you already gave a ruling that he was just moving the

motion and that debate will start later on. But, Sri Anna Rao Ganamukhi when he was in the Chair seems to have given a contradictory ruling.

MR. SPEAKER.—At the time when Sri S. Sivappa gave an oral notice saying that the Bill be circulated, I said, on the objections raised by the Minister for Revenue, that the Hon'ble Member had given the notice a little late and that the motion had already been put before the House. I said that he could move it. I permitted him and I circulated the amendment and he moved it. Afterwards it was put to the House for discussion and I discretely said that both the main motion and the amendment were before the House and that the debate would proceed on both. One or two members thought, as I could infer from the scope of the discussion in the House, that it was only the amendment that was being discussed. Evidently they thought that the main motion could not be considered if the amendment was allowed. That is an erroneous impression. Normally the time is to be utilised to the advantage of the House, there should be no duplication of the work. If there is any rule with regard to identical question, namely, where a motion has been moved for the second reading and the amendment is made by any member that it should be circulated, then the scope of the debate is identically same, rule 73(3) says.—

“On the day on which any motion that the bill be taken into consideration by the Assembly either at once or at some future day is moved, the principal of the bill and its general provisions may be discussed, but the details of the bill shall not be discussed further than is necessary to explain its principles.”